

REMARKSClaim Changes

Claims 1-16 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action dated June 28, 2008 states “[T]he title of the invention , ‘System and Method for Managing Time-Go-Live information of Media Content’, is incorrect. According to the oath and declaration” See Office Action item 2 on page 2. In response to the objection, Applicant has amended the title of the invention as requested.

Rejection of claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,772,203 (Feiertag)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 17-31. Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Feiertag is moot in view of the cancellation of claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that Feiertag does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claims 17, 22, and 27. For example, independent claims 17 and 22 recite “provid[ing] a first media content item and a first time-to-live (TTL) associated with the first media content item to a remote device... identify[ing] a second media content item associated with the first media content item” and “determine[ing] a second TTL based on the first media content item” which is not anticipated either expressly or inherently, in Feiertag. Similarly, independent claim 27 recites “receiving a media content item and a first time-to-live (TTL) associated with the media content item from a remote device; and receiving an identifier and a second TTL associated with the media content

item from the remote device; identifying the media content item based on the identifier; and replacing the first TTL with the second TTL” which is not anticipated by Feiertag.

Feiertag is directed to a method of updating a time-to-live period for the data object stored in the cache based on the hit rate and the change rate for the data object. See Feiertag Abstract. Feiertag describes transmitting a data object stored in the cache server in response to receiving a request after verifying the TTL. However, Feiertag fails to describe providing a TTL to the remote device. In Feiertag, the TTL is generated and updated locally at the cache server. The cache server sends data objects to a user after checking the content for TTL and duplicate copies at blocks 234, 236 and 244. See Feiertag FIG. 2B, col. 3, line 5-34. Since, in Feiertag the cache server does not send TTL to the remote device, Feiertag fails to describe providing TTL to the remote device.

Additionally, Applicant submits that Feiertag fails to describe “identifying a second media content item associated with the first media content item and determining a second TTL based on the first media content item.” Applicant requests the Examiner to provide exact citations from Feiertag which anticipate the claimed limitations.

In view of the forgoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Feiertag does not disclose all the claim features recited in independent claims 17, 22, and 27. Applicant therefore submits that independent claims 17, 22, and 27 are not anticipated by Feiertag, and therefore the rejection of independent claims 17, 22 and 27 under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that independent claims 17, 22, and 27 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 18-21 and 23-26 and 28-31 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 17, 22, and 27. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 18-21 and 23-26 and 28-31 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant has reviewed the other references of record and believes that Applicant’s claimed invention is patentably distinct and nonobvious over each reference taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any

questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

/HISASHI D. WATANABE/ 10/04/2008

Please forward all correspondence to:

Motorola, Inc.

Law Department (HDW)

600 North US Highway 45

Libertyville, IL 60048

Hisashi D. Watanabe

Date

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 37,465

Telephone: (847) 523-2322

Facsimile: (847) 523-2350